



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,210	05/30/2001	Scott Wolinsky	**NI-0006	7821
23377 7590 01/14/2009 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891				
EXAMINER				
PANDYA, SUNT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/14/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

09/870,210

**Applicant(s)**

WOLINSKY, SCOTT

**Examiner**

SUNIT PANDYA

**Art Unit**

3714

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 4, 7-11, 17-18, 20, 23-27, 33-35, 37, 41, 45-47, 49, 53, 81-83, 85, 88-89, 91, 95-97, 99, 102-103, 105, 109-110, 112-118, 120-128, 130-135, 137-141, 143-147, 149-155 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/18/08, 11/6/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,2,4,7-11,17,18,20,23-27,33-35,37,41,45-47,49,53,81-83,85,88,89,91,95-97,99,102,103,105,109,110,112-118,120-128,130-135,137-141,143-147 and 149-155.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/6/08 has been entered.

The examiner acknowledges that claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25, 33-35, 41, 45-47, 53, 81-83, 91, 95-97, 105, 109-110, 113-115, 117-118, 121-123, 125-128, 132-135, 139, 145-146, 150-155 are amended by the applicant. Consequently claims 1-2, 4, 7-11, 17-18, 20, 23-27, 33-35, 37, 41, 45-47, 49, 53, 81-83, 85, 88-89, 91, 95-97, 99, 102-103, 105, 109-110, 112-118, 120-128, 130-135, 137-141, 143-147, 149-155 are pending in the instant application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 17, 81, 95, 109, 117, 151 & 152 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the said claims, the language states "...comparing, by the first terminal, the identification information received..." However the specification fails to disclose any information regarding "comparison" of any information. For the purpose of this rejection, all the claims are given broadest reasonable claim interpretation.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 130 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim 130 depends on claim 129, which has been canceled by the applicant.. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim 130 has not been further treated on the merits.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 81 and 95 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darling (WO 93/23125).  
Regarding claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 81 and 95:

Darling discloses a multiplayer game system utilizing a wireless communications link wherein the game system operates without the use of a central server. Each game terminal is allocated a certain time slot or turn (feature 324, figure 4) wherein the game terminal transmits its game data which is generated at the initial (first) terminal to the other game terminals (feature 328, figure 4) to progress the game in response to the instruction to determine the outcome (being the allocated turn of the machine). The game also provides player indicators such as a "Master status indicator" (page 15), address/data (page 8), or player identifiers (A, B, C of pages 19-21 wherein each letter represents a player or player name page 9, second paragraph "David D. has killed the Dragon"). The transmitted and retrieved information is stored in each of the gaming terminal's RAM (page 10 and 11) wherein these values can include data, numbers, items, and player outcomes. Once the game machines have received the data, the game progresses by switching to another machine wherein the other machine becomes the one to transmit the outcome. After outcomes have been transmitted, they are also displayed to the display of the machines (15), (pages 4, 8, 9-12 and 16-21 along with figures 1 and 4).

Claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 20, 23, 24, 33, 35, 37, 41, 45, 47, 49, 53, 82, 83, 85, 89, 91, 96, 97, 99, 103, 105, 109, 110, 112, 113, 117, 118, 120, 121, 125, 128, 130, 132, 135, 137, 139, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 152, 154 and 155 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darling (WO 93/23125) as applied to claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 81

and 95 above, and further in view of Online Monopoly and Tanskanen (US 6,579,184 B1).

Darling meets the claimed limitation as discussed in the rejection of claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 81 and 95 above is incorporated herein.

Regarding claims 4, 20, 37, 49, 83, 85, 97, 99, 112, 120, 130, 137, 141, 143, 147, 149:

Darling further teaches that many games can be played on the system including that of Dungeons and Dragons which is known to include the use of dice rolling (random number generators), however Darling fails to explicitly recite the use of a random number generator or dice. However in a related system, Online Monopoly teaches the use of a networked game system that plays Monopoly over a network of linked game machines wherein the game simulates the roll of a dice via a random outcome generator, thus the outcome is the amount generated by the dice. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the known improvement of simulated dice rolling for conventional board games implemented in a networked electronic system in order to yield the predictable result of producing a electronic version of a conventional board game such as that of Monopoly or Dungeons and Dragons.

Further regarding claims 2, 7, 8, 18, 23, 24, 33, 35, 41, 45, 47, 82, 96, 117, 125, 132, 139, 145, 152, 154 and 155:

The prior art is further silent regarding the specifics of the communications link/means being a dual tone multi-frequency signal (DTMF) and the link being a

telephone/wireless phone line. Darling does however teach that the communications link is a radio frequency (page 8 paragraph 3 and page 9 paragraph 1, wherein Darling teaches of player's request being communicated) or transmitted using "any suitably adapted communications protocol known to those skilled in the art" (page 17 paragraph 4). One of such suitably adapted communications protocols is that of a wireless telephone line utilizing a DTMF signal such as that taught by Tanskanen (2:1-27). Tanskanen provides teaching that enables one of ordinary skill in the art to find it obvious to use DTMF signals as a means of communicating information between the gaming terminals of Darling. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the known in-band DTMF signals as taught by Tanskanen in the networked game system of Darling in order to achieve the predictable result of a wireless gaming system which utilizes inband DTMF signals as a data transmission means.

Further regarding claims 41, 53, 91, 105, 109, 117, 125, 132, 139, 145, 152, 154 and 155:

The prior art is further silent regarding the gaming terminals being wireless telephones. However it is notoriously well known in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement networked games such as those taught by Darling and Online Monopoly in wireless telecommunications devices. One would be motivated to do so in order to achieve the predictable result of increasing the functionality of a wireless telephones whereby increasing their appeal to potential customers as it is known that one of the many selling points for a wireless telephone is the inclusion of games.



Regarding claim 110, 118, 128 and 135, Darling teaches that the communications link is a wireless link (page 8, 9, wherein the communication can be a voice signaled communication means).

Regarding claim 113, 121 and 152, instructions for defining a plurality of identifiers used to differentiate between said wireless telephones; and determining, at each of said wireless telephones, from which wireless telephone said signal originated (please see rejection of claim 1 and figure 4, pages 16-21 of Darling).

Regarding claims 89 and 103, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, it would have been obvious for a player to place a bet based on the outcome of the die before each turn with Online MONOPOLY® and Tanskanen. One would be motivated to do so because this would provide a side game making the main game more exciting.

Claims 10, 26, 114, 122, 126, 133, 140, 146, 151 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darling in view of Online Monopoly and Tanskanen and further in view of Teshima et al. (U.S. 5,273,288).

The prior art lacks in explicitly teaching:

Regarding Claims 10, 26, 114, 122, 126, 133, 140, 146, 151:

- conversing parties associated with said terminals can spontaneously set up and play a game without interfering with an ongoing conversation over said communications link.

Teshima et al., like Tanskanen, Online MONOPOLY® and Darling, teaches game(s) that can be played over a communications line, such as, a telephone line. Therefore, Tanskanen, Online MONOPOLY®, Stancill and Teshima et al. are analogous art. Furthermore, Teshima et al. teaches each player has a game board that is connected to a telephone line such that one player can play a game against another player in real-time over a telephone line. Teshima et al. additionally teaches:

- conversing parties associated with said terminals can spontaneously set up and play a game without interfering with an ongoing conversation over said communications link (column 3, lines 10-21).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to incorporate Teshima's communication feature in Online MONOPOLY® in view of Tanskanen, Celona and Stancill. One would be motivated to do so because enabling players to converse during the game makes the game more entertaining a personally interactive.

Claims 11, 27, 34, 46, 115, 116, 123, 124, 127, 131, 134, 138, 144, 150, 153 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darling in view of Online Monopoly and Tanskanen and further in view of Stancill (US 4,421,314).

The prior art meets the claimed limitations as discussed above, however they seem to lack in explicitly teaching:

Regarding Claims 11, 27, 34, 46, 115, 116, 123, 124, 127, 131, 134, 138, 144, 150, 153:

- each identifier is represented by a different color emitted by one or more LED's (Column 3, lines 40-57). Stancill distinguishes player pieces, chips, and die by having different color player pieces, chips, and die for each player.

It would have been obvious at the time of Applicant's invention to play an Online MONOPOLY® boardgame on Darling in view of Tanskanen multi-player game system utilizing Stancill's player distinguishing features. One would be motivated to do so since MONOPOLY® is a historically popular game and also to enhance the graphics on the display screen to make it easier for player's to distinguish between game tokens.

Claims 88 and 102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darling in view of Online Monopoly and Tanskanen and further in view of McKay et al. (U.S.Pat. 6,400,002).

The prior art seems to lack explicitly teaching:

Regarding Claims 88 and 102:

- the displayed outcome simulates a timer.

McKay et al. teaches of a trivia board game played on a personal computer. McKay et al., Tanskanen, Online MONOPOLY® and Darling are analogous art since each teaches of board games. McKay et al. teaches:

Regarding Claims 88 and 102:

- the displayed outcome simulates a timer (13) (fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to incorporate McKay's timer in Online MONOPOLY® in view of Tanskanen, Celona and Stancill. One would be motivated to do so to place a limit on the amount of time a player has to decide whether to purchase a property the player has landed on during their turn.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4, 7-11, 17-18, 20, 23-27, 33-35, 37, 41, 45-47, 49, 53, 81-83, 85, 88-89, 91, 95-97, 99, 102-103, 105, 109-110, 112-118, 120-128, 130-135, 137-141, 143-147, 149-155 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Examiner has cited particular page and paragraph numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUNIT PANDYA whose telephone number is (571)272-2823. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SP

/Scott E. Jones/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714